



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BRIEF MENTION.

The first part of VON DOBSCHÜTZ'S *Christusbilder* (Leipzig, Hinrichs) appeared early enough in the year to win a reference in USENER'S *Sintfluthsagen* (A. J. P. XX 210); the second part, with its *Beilagen*, has just come to hand. The work, which forms the third volume of VON GEBHARDT AND HARNACK'S *Texte u. Untersuchungen zur altchristlichen Literatur*, appeals to wider circles than could have been reached by its predecessors, and in default of a critical study, which could hardly be expected here, it would be a pleasure to give the readers of the Journal an outline of VON DOBSCHÜTZ'S researches and results. But as the space at my command is limited, I must be content with this *Brief Mention*. The title, *Christusbilder*, as the writer himself admits, is somewhat misleading, and it would be a pity if a student of art should invest his thirty-two marks in a work on Christian Art and find instead a treatise on Early Christian Literature. Catalogues have led to many laughable errors; the sombre verse of Young's Night Thoughts was palmed off in its day by unscrupulous peddlers as an English companion to the Basia of Johannes Secundus; the seductive title of the Diversions of Purley was a standing joke among our grandfathers; and Daudet's Sapho figures in the annals of the Greek Lyric. The subtitle, it is true, would save the intending purchaser from such a mistake as our author deprecates, but people who order books do not always scan subtitles closely. In consonance with the whole character of modern research, VON DOBSCHÜTZ'S investigations trace the growth of Christian institutions back to the heathen soil from which they sprung, and the first chapter deals with the *διηγεση* of antiquity from Homer down. The aversion of the Early Church to pictures of Our Lord was fully overcome only when Christianity became the religion of the state and entered upon the inheritance of all the paraphernalia of the earlier faith. In after-times, especially in the Greek Church, the *ζωγράφος* was counted a manner of *λογογράφος*, the painter a gospeller and the picture became for some the sole evangel. The heathen 'image which fell down from Jupiter,' one of the beasts which Paul fought with at Ephesus, was succeeded by the *ἀχειροποίητος* (*εἰκών*); and the history of these miraculous likenesses of Our Saviour is given in detail. A long chapter is taken up with the Legend of Abgar and the Christ of Edessa, another with the story of Veronica, the *Βερονίκη*, whose Latin name lent itself to the anagram *Vera icon*. The authorities are given at the end of the book and the passages quoted in full. So, for instance, the

chapter on the Palladium is backed by a long array of extracts extending from Homer to the sham Eudokia (A. J. P. III 489, IV 109, V 114, VII 104), a fraud which, as VON DOBSCHÜTZ observes, the specimen given here would suffice to expose. The second part, containing the *Beilagen*, presents us with a number of documents pertaining to the various chapters, some of them in new editions and emended texts, some published for the first time,—a mine of curious reading, not without occasional profit for the philological soul.

---

Just at this time there are signs of a reaction in favor of Cicero (A. J. P. XVIII 242), and it is a somewhat scurvy trick of Fortune that interest should be revived in the great Ciceromastix DRUMANN by a new edition of his inevitable work, *Geschichte Roms in seinem Uebergange von der republikanischen zur monarchischen Verfassung, oder Pompeius, Caesar, Cicero und ihre Zeitgenossen* (Berlin, Gebrüder Borntraeger). The publishers tell us that this reproduction is due in a measure to the liberal support of the von Siemens grandchildren of the historian, who doubtless take a pride in the political attitude of the author and rejoice in his triphammer way of dealing with those who strove to uphold republican institutions. "Der Preusse, der Unterthan eines Friedrich Wilhelm," says Drumann at the close of his preface, "kann kein anderes politisches Glaubensbekenntnis haben als: ἡ μοναρχία κράτιστον." For 'Frederick William the Third' read 'William the Second,' and history repeats itself. But the reader of Herodotos will not forget that the sentiment was put in the mouth of Darius, who as the future winner had the last word assigned to him. The editor, P. GROEBE, announces that he has made no change in the text beyond the correction of a few manifest errors. In the footnotes the references have been altered to suit the new editions of the original authorities, and some use has been made of those post-Drumannian works that, in the judgment of the editor, mark an advance in the treatment of the subject. Of course, there are those who tax DRUMANN with gross partisanship, unscrupulous pettifoggery and remorseless vindictiveness, and put not the slightest faith in his profession that his results were forced on him. And yet those who are least indulgent to him are fain to acknowledge that he has been most diligent in his research, and all who have wrought in the same domain have levied freely on the quarry that he has opened. The first volume of the new edition is occupied chiefly with the great triumvir, Mark Antony. An appendix contains considerable additions by the editor (pp. 399-484).

---

'Source' is a word of fear to those who have been brought into contact with the swarm of dissertations which deal with the *fontes*

of this and the *fontes* of that, many of them tedious, mechanical and inconclusive. What is properly a *Quelle* is a matter of dispute which Professor BAUER, in the volume recently noticed (A. J. P. XX 225), does not undertake to settle. But whether we limit the word to an historical composition or extend it to an historical document of any kind, there is no question about the usefulness of such a collection as VON SCALA has made in his *Staatsverträge des Alterthums* (Teubner), the first part of which appeared too late to be included in Bauer's review of the decennium 1888-1898. This part begins with a treaty between Karaindaš of Babylonia and the King of Egypt, 1450 B. C., and ends with the extension of the Sicilian rule under Timoleon 338. The second part will comprise the treaties made to 476 A. D., and awaits the collation of the inscriptions.

---

In a recent number of the *Revue des études grecques*, G. D., commenting on BOLLING'S *Participle in Hesiod*, says: "Je crois que bien interprétée, la statistique appliquée à un ouvrage homogène peut rendre de grands services. Mais il me semble qu'il n'y a rien ou presque rien à tirer de la comparaison de deux statistiques, reposant sur deux ouvrages de dates et d'auteurs différents. Que peut bien démontrer la statistique comparée du nombre des participes par cent vers dans l'*Iliade*, l'*Odyssée*, la *Théogonie*, les *Travaux* et les *Jours*, le *Bouclier d'Héraclès*, si non que le style et les idées de ces divers poèmes sont essentiellement dissemblables?" Such curiosities of criticism are worth preserving as specimens of the hopeless divergencies of view to be found in the realm of grammatical studies. As an early worker in statistical syntax I have always held that if there is any value in this line of research, and I do not exaggerate that value (A. J. P. XIII 123), it lies precisely in the exact measure it gives of the development of style and the sphere of constructions, and from my first published study to the last number of the *Journal* (XX 227) I have emphasized the importance of comparative statistics. But while I am not quite ready to say *εἰς κενὸν ἐκοπίασα*, I am liberal enough to record an *obiter dictum*, which quietly disposes of a great deal of hard work that has been done in this field of research, and so I give the French scholar his fling in the *Journal* itself, where so much space has been given to statistical syntax.

---

To translate the Greek participle by a subordinate sentence, temporal, causal, conditional, is a makeshift. To translate it by an abstract noun is a makeshift. Neither of these devices reproduces the true effect of the participle, which belongs to its substantive like a skin—not a human skin, but, let us say, a dog's skin. Hence I am not surprised that Professor STAHL, in a

recent number of the *Rheinisches Museum* (LIV 3), has declined to accept some of the examples in which I suggested the abstract translation. See A. J. P. XIX 463. The German scholar is under the domination of German tradition, as Classen was (A. J. P. VI 314, IX 138); and doubtless my renderings are determined by the atmospheric pressure of the English idiom. The great thing after all is to feel the Greek participle directly (Pindar, I. E., cx), and so, for instance, it is better not to analyze Theognis 509: οἶνος πινόμενος πούλῳς κακόν, although it is in my judgment demonstrable that the Greeks came to use the participle consciously as a condensed form of a subordinate clause (XVIII 244, 369), and although Theognis himself teaches us how to do it in this particular case by adding: ἦν δέ τις αὐτὸν | πίνῃ ἐπισταμένως οὐ κακόν ἀλλ' ἀγαθόν. Nor are we to recast the words in our mind, whatever we may do in translation, although Theognis himself has given us the other version (v. 211): οἶνόν τοι πίνειν πούλῳν κακόν. Professor STAHL is still under the impression that Thukydides has an unusual proportion of participles that may be rendered by an abstract formula. If so, this is one of the points that show a certain congeniality between Thukydides and those Latin authors that favor this turn. "Permagna est," said Lübbert many years ago (Comment. Synt. Partic. I), "scriptorum in hoc idiomate ponendo pro cuiusque vel ingenio vel scribendi proposito diversitas: nam sunt qui eo mirum quantum delectentur, sunt qui prorsus ab eo absteineant. Et confert illud sane plurimum ad certum aliquem colorem orationi imponendum: nam cum in universum poeticum semper ornatum adferat, modo ita ponitur, ut vivam ipsarum rerum imaginem experimant . . . modo miram vim et breviter orationi adfert cum nomen abstractum quod vocant ad res e vita ipsa petitas refertur." Assuredly, this use of the participle seems to give a higher note. We expect it in Pindar. We do not expect it in Strabo, and yet we find it X 5. 4: τὴν Δῆλον ἠὔξησε . . . κατασκαφεῖσα ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων Κόρινθος, which is exactly parallel with the only Pindaric example that STAHL frankly accepts, Pyth. XI 22, I. E., cxiii.

---

Professor WEIL's new edition of the *Medea* (Hachette) is styled *troisième édition révisée*, while his *Iphigenia at Aulis* appears in a *troisième édition remaniée*. The text of the third *Medea* differs from that of the second in twenty passages, duly recorded after the list of MSS. The text of the third *Iphigenia* differs from that of the second in thirty-two passages, also registered in advance, a feature quite in keeping with the editor's admirable economy of his reader's time. It is hard to define τὸ φορτικόν, but in philology puffiness is a phase of it, and it is precisely the absence of puffiness that gives a certain aristocratic distinction to M. WEIL's editorial work, to which I have repeatedly done homage. In the third edition of the I. A., M. WEIL has

not budged from the conservative position he held in the second edition (A. J. P. II 267), and while he does not withhold from Mr. ENGLAND'S work (A. J. P. XIII 496) the praise it deserves, he shrinks from the 'difficult and daring' attempt to go back to the MS of the poet himself. Among the new readings in I. A. may be mentioned v. 823, where the  $\mu\eta$  in  $\sigma\upsilon$  θαυμά σ' ἡμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν οὐδς  $\mu\eta$  πάρος has given the editors some trouble. "The same generalizing  $\mu\eta$ ," says England, "as at v. 834, but it is slightly more remarkable here, as the relative with which it is joined has its antecedent," and so much more remarkable does M. WEIL consider it that he changes the ἡμᾶς of the text into δητὰ σ'—in my judgment, quite unnecessarily. See A. J. P. I 54, where the point is covered, several of the passages cited having antecedents expressed. Add Herodot. 3, 21 and revise Stein's note on 3, 65. M. WEIL still considers v. 418: ὥστε τερφεθείης ἰδών, a vicious reading, and England, who brackets the line, says that it is 'actually defended' by certain scholars there named, who have thereby, I suppose, damned themselves eternally. That there is a possible way of escape without the loss of one's grammatical soul, I have already intimated (A. J. P. VII 173). Indeed, I have long been of the opinion that enough scope has not been given to the imperative optative (Pindar, I. E., civ), and if the imperative after ὥστε is not a monster, why should an imperative optative be?

---

I had resolved to say nothing about Professor HARRY'S *Hippolytus* (Ginn), for somewhat the same reason that I declined to bestow any special commendation on BLAKE'S *Hellenica* (A. J. P. XVI 262); but the printer needs a few lines. Both the editors have expressed themselves as indebted to my work and both the editors have made large use of my formulae—BLAKE with almost painful scrupulousness of reference, whereas HARRY has not thought it worth while to particularize, except in a few instances. It is one of the rewards and at the same time one of the penalties of long activity as a teacher and as a writer, to find one's self depersonalized. But, after all, it is better to live on as a nameless rule than to be set up like the Canon Dawesianus, for every rudesby to have a shy at.

---

CORRECTION.—For 'the great Pendragonship' in the last number of the Journal, p. 213, l. 13 from bottom, read 'the barge of Arthur.'

---

E. W. F.: ERRATA AND CORRIGENDA.—In my article on *Infinitas it*, vol. XX, No. 2, in §6, l. 4 read 'ap. Nonium'; §17, ll. 3, 11, 36 read 'Predicative' for 'Appositive'; §17, l. 37 read 'agreeing with' for 'appositive to'; §20, l. 6 read '*redieit*,' not '*redicit*.'